

No. 410.

Official Organ of the Australasian
Socialist Party.

SATURDAY, MARCH 9th, 1918

Registered at the General Post Office, Sydney,
for transmission by post as a Newspaper.

Price: One Penny

A Review and a Retrospect.

Compiled by J. A. D., W. H. J. B. S.

CONTINUED FROM LAST ISSUE

But to get back to the period of the communist war. On the surface it seemed that it would have taken a generation at least for a novel to reach extensive proportions. For the army was with the author. The recruits were rowed into submissiveness by relentless exertions. Prisoners and captives dominated the intellectual and the middle class.

Back in 1902 the Socialist-Democratic Party had divided into two wings—the Bolsheviks and the Mensheviks. The Bolsheviks aimed at securing a maximum of demands by revolution, while the Mensheviks were pacifists, who depended upon compromise, by politics, to reach their objective. They both had sympathies in the common purpose of dethroning the Czar oligarchy, but differed on the question of tactics.

The real revolutionaries—the Industrialists—the Bolsheviks—had men in their ranks who understood history. They knew that Man makes his own history. They knew that he does not make it out of whole cloth; he does not make it out of conditions chosen by himself, but he makes history out of such as he finds close at hand. The traditions of all past generations weigh like an Alp upon the brain of the living—but to these men and women of the revolutionary movement, tradition and the past meant one thing only—that is, that they must learn a lesson from all mistakes, false moves and bad tactics. Just before the outbreak of the war the work of the Bolsheviks had developed to such an extent that the great strike of Russian workmen had been precipitated. Practically all the workers of St. Petersburg were out on strike, and but for the outbreak of the war the revolution would have been consummated then in-

stead of in 1917. The ruling classes seized upon patriotic sentiment and national feeling to defeat the revolutionary spirit. But for the Bolsheviks the revolution was not failed; it was merely postponed. These comrades continued to agitate, educate and organise for the whole thing—the Social Revolution. They were not to be whetted into the bogs of reform. No! They demanded the whole lot, nothing less. These were the Maximalists.

At the outbreak of the war the political Socialists—the Mensheviks section of the Social-Democrats, intellectuals, and progressive revolutionists joined hand in hand with their bitterest enemies in a common attitude towards the war. Like many Socialists in other countries many of the Social-Democrats, the Mensheviks, were only simple Marxians; they had not yet learned that a knowledge and practice of tactics were also absolutely necessary. In fact, that is the chief thing the knowledge of Economics is useful for, to show the right path and right tactics. Karl Marx said himself he was no Marxist. He gave the key to a scientific working class movement. There is always a tendency to "bring down the Marxian theory of development to a rigid orthodoxy," said Engels, and for Marx to have become a Bible is a fatal process. That spirit of ecclesiastical dogmatism which has been the curse of religion shows up in such Socialism as that of the Social-Democrats with its lack of interpretation of passing events.

Russia's path to political freedom lay through economic development, according to the Menshevik Social-Democratic view. They had their eyes fixed on political freedom as the means of emancipating the worker, whereas the Bolsheviks, I.E. INDUSTRIAL SOCIALISTS, had their eyes fixed on economic freedom, well knowing that the political is but a reflex of the economic. Russia was still a feudal nation, economically the most backward in Europe, but apparently it seemed, judging from their tactics and aims right up to December, 1917, that the Menshevik Social-Democrats did not fully recognise that the semi-feudalism of Russia was not the same as the semi-feudalism overthrown by capitalism in Great Britain. The remnants of feudalism although still existing in Russia in 1914, had been profoundly influenced by the capitalism of the great European powers, hence was different in quality and degree from that of Great Britain and France in the past.

Russia's commercial relations with Germany were of such a nature as to keep her as long as possible in that feudal state. Germany drew from Russia most of the raw material responsible for her own industrial expansion. To keep Russia raw, not to allow her to develop industrially and commercially were the political aims of Germany. By means of political influence in the Russian Government she was enabled to conclude treaties and win privileges which were designed to interfere with Russia's economic progress.

The Social-Democrats were too academic in their interpretation of the truth that so long as Russia remained a great feudal country there was little hope of her becoming a democratic state.

These academic Mensheviks argued in this way :—

"It is the transformation from feudalism to capitalism that creates powerful

forces for political freedom. The new development of large industrial and middle classes incident to such transformation means the development of democratic currents and elements in the nation. All other countries have passed through this stage to get political freedom, and so must Russia. Russia presents a large and fertile field for economic enterprise. Her natural resources are great enough to make her in a short time one of the leading capitalistic countries in Europe. But Germany is in the way. Besides, Germany has no surpluses to invest in Russia. France and Great Britain are the great capitalistic entrepreneurs in the world. What Russia needs is an economic union with these two nations not with Germany. Most of the ante-bellum investments in Russia came from these two countries. But Russia needs much more capital. And to bring her into closer contact with these two economic pioneers it is necessary to release her from German tutelage."

On such ground the Mensheviks Social-Democrats built their arguments as to why Russia should fight Germany to the bitter end. Their eyes well filled with the picture of the evolution from feudalism to capitalism, a necessary historical step, they argued, preceding political liberty, and the hastening of this evolutionary process they saw a guarantee for the speedy arrival of such liberty in Russia.

But how different was the attitude of the Industrialists!—the real revolutionary Socialists—the Bolsheviks. They did not share in these views. They did not change their former attitude towards the Czar's Government. They even argued that perhaps Russia's defeat in the war was the surest way of bringing about the downfall of Czarism. They were even jeered at as "porazhentsi," which means advocates of defeat. Regarding the war as a struggle for capitalistic domination exclusively, they took the stand that the interests of Socialism could not be served by the victory of German or French, Russian and British arms, as **LABOR HAS NO COUNTRY.** According to them, it was from an economic slavery which the workers should free themselves, and this slavery was international and common to all countries alike. To co-operate with the Czar's Government? It was impossible for them even to contemplate! This group was the only element in popular Russia who opposed the war. It made itself felt during the thirty months of war which preceded the political revolution in March, 1917.

The Lettish Bolsheviks, always in the vanguard of the revolutionary Russian proletariat, is an example. In spite of all dangers and prosecutions, it maintained a tireless agitation against the war in factories and barracks, amongst workmen, soldiers and recruits, and exerted an influence far beyond the boundaries of the Baltic provinces. During the first year of war it published forty appeals against the war in Lettish, Lithuanian and Russian and distributed over half a million copies.

The bourgeoisie hastened to prove its "loyalty" to the Czar, noisy patriotism was the order of the day. In short, the situation was created to which the words of Karl Kautsky so aptly apply:

" . . . then all will become patriots even, those of international leanings, and if any had the superhuman courage to go against it . . . the Government would not even have to lift its little finger to render them harmless. The furious crowd itself would strike them dead."

Yet the Lettish S.D.P. had this courage, it was not "struck dead," but on the contrary gained the confidence of the working masses of Lettland from day to day. From the first day of the war its war cries were "War against War!" "Long live the class struggle and international working class solidarity! . . ." The political Labor press both in the Baltic provinces as well as in the whole of

THE SONG OF THE SCAR

Wherever the bitter fight is on,
For life against human greed;
Where the workers rally ere hope is gone
That nerves for the valiant deed;
When the price is paid in silent pain,
In want and the nameless dread,
And the victory near, then the scabs
sneak in,
Like the ghouls that rob the dead.
They pluck from a vine they did not
prune
They reap where they have not sown,
With a canting look and a craven heart,
And a soul that is not their own.
In a darker age, when the world was
young,
This jackal human crew
Skulked in the rear while the fight was
on,
And preyed on the valiant few.
They snatched the bone from a woman's
hand,
And snarled at a hungered child;
Till the heroes perished from out the
land,
And earth's gardens became a wild.
And ever and ever, where human greed
Holds the human race in thrall,
The fight will be fought by the nobler
few,
And the victory shared by all.
Then falter not till the fight is won,
There is only your fear to dread;
Though cowards skulk, and scabs sneak
in,
Like ghouls that rob the dead.
—Chicago "Bakers' Journal."

Russia was destroyed and suppressed. But right from the beginning of the war the underground presses were busy turning out tens of thousands of revolutionary leaflets every week and distributing them over the provinces. These leaflets contained such messages as: "The present war is being waged in the Imperialist interest of the ruling classes; the war brings no relief or freedom for the toiling masses, only want and misery. The ruling capitalist class and the Government in one's own country are the enemy, not the workers of the lands waging war. The workers have no 'fatherland' to defend, but must keep intact their international solidarity. The only war the workers have to wage is the revolutionary class struggle for the attainment of the Socialist Commonwealth."

History records that it was radical revolutionary Russia that was divided on the issues of the great struggle, the constitutional Democratic Party was unanimous in its attitude toward the war, and many of the Social-Democrats sided with them.

It was the same in Russia as in Australia—the real Socialists opposed the war, taking a similar attitude to the revolutionaries. The Socialists of Germany as voiced by Karl Liebknecht in his speech on December 2nd, 1914, in the German Reichstag, voted against the War Credit Bill: "It is an imperialist war, a war for the rule of the world market. . . . The German watchword 'against Czarism' is proclaimed for the purpose—just as the present British and French watchwords 'against Militarism' are proclaimed to exploit the noblest inclinations and the revolutionary traditions and ideals of the people in stirring up hatred of other peoples.

"Germany, the accomplice of Czarism, the model of political reaction until this very day, has no standing as the liberator of the peoples. The liberation of both the Russian and the German people must be their own work."

(To be Continued.)

THE
INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST.OFFICIAL ORGAN OF THE AUSTRALASIAN
SOCIALIST PARTY.SUBSCRIPTION RATES: Australia, 4/- per
year; 1/- per quarter. Postage added to
other countries.ORDERS FOR PAPERS to be sent to the
Press Committee, 115 Goulburn Street,
Sydney.

MATTER FOR PUBLICATION.

All articles and matter for publication must
be addressed to the "Press Committee" and
accompanied by the name and address of the
writer (not necessarily for publication).Write on one side of the paper only, and be
sure to write in ink.Rejected manuscript will be returned if
stamps are enclosed for that purpose.

WHEN YOUR SUBSCRIPTION IS DUE.

Every subscriber will be notified by circular
when his subscription runs out. The number
of the last issue to be posted will be indicated.

Beeby's Bill.

A SNARE AND A DELUSION.

By J. A. Dawson.

Mr. Beeby's speech in the Legislative Assembly on his Industrial Arbitration Bill, strikes a new note now being sounded by apologists of capitalism not only in Australia, but throughout the whole world. Capital is getting fearful. "Labor in the mass is in a nasty mood," says the "London Economist," but capital is still trying to delude the working class by promising reforms to take the edge off their nastiness. Mr. Beeby stated: "The process of reconstruction would in many countries be more difficult than was the creation and maintenance of means for continuing the war." Yes, Mr. Beeby, the workers were easy enough to soothe on—HIT—it will not be as easy to call them off unless they get the meat.

An article which appeared on the financial page of the "New York American," contained the following statement: "If the restoration of normal industrial conditions after the war should come to pass without a labor revolt throughout the world having as its objective or co-operative ownership of all industry, the Secretary of Labor and the Minister of Labor in foreign cabinets will be incumbents of offices exceeded in importance only by those held by Presidents and Prime Ministers."

Mr. Beeby, speaking for the employing class, said: "Every man who carefully watched the course of events was impressed with the dangerous possibilities of the future." We would ask Mr. Beeby: Dangerous to whom? Mr. Beeby, there are "dangerous possibilities" to the capitalist class, who you now so ably represent, but in a working class manner. Their "nastiness" has a meaning. They present, Labor is now audacious, not probably in the sense Mr. Lloyd George intend to get rid of their exploiters.

Mr. Beeby said that "a great psychological wave" had swept over European countries—particularly over Great Britain. Yes, Mr. Beeby, and more particularly still over Russia! At the British Trade Union Congress last September the burning issue was industrial unionism against craft and sectional unions, and the dominant note was that it will overshadow all other questions in the future. Now, Mr. Beeby, you as an ex-Labor man, know that industrial unionism is something vitally different from trade unionism. You know that political opportunists, like yourself, will be left with no alternative other than to go to work, when the industrialists are dominant. You knew that your political end was approaching, so you threw in your lot with the enemies of labor, and now you are very much concerned as to the "dangerous possibilities." Mr. Beeby, it would have been far better for you never to have been a champion (?) of Labor, than to have been once the trusted representative of the working class and then to traitorously desert them and go over to the enemy.

Mr. Beeby said that: "Industries had

been regarded as institutions created for the purpose of profit-making, but to which was also attached the necessary evil of payment of wages. . . . Labor has been regarded merely as a commodity in the market, which anyone was justified in purchasing at the lowest possible price. But Labor was in revolt against this idea, and no country could afford to disregard its claims for a new working basis. . . . the worker must be accepted as an integral part of industry entitled to a return for his labor which guaranteed a reasonable standard of comfort, and that certainty of tenure which had been denied him in the past. . . . In the new measure he proposed to lay the foundation of a system which might lead to a better understanding between employer and employee, and which might counteract the vicious declaration of recent years that class warfare is eternal and immutable."

Mr. Beeby, your Bill is doomed to failure. The interests of wage workers and employers are diametrically opposed. What do they fight over? They fight over the products of industry—the results of Labor's toil. Now the new note of Labor's demand is that "LABOR IS ENTITLED TO ALL IT PRODUCES." The employers will never agree to that. But, Mr. Beeby, there is no need for such a silly declaration that "class warfare is eternal and immutable." You speak of the "difficult industrial problem." Mr. Beeby, get it out of your mind; it is not a difficult problem at all. It is quite simple—from the working class standpoint.

We want all we produce, and we know how to get it. And when we get it there won't be a class war any longer. It is not going to be an "eternal" affair. In fact it is going to end very soon. But it is going to be a "difficult problem" for the employing class to stop us. Well, Mr. Beeby, the more difficulties you place in our way, the more "dangerous possibilities" there are in store for such enemies of Labor as yourself and the class you represent. You can't arbitrate between irreconcilable interests, between robber and robbed. You say that industry has been "based on old economic theories." Yes, and, Mr. Beeby, let me tell you that your proposals are based upon theories that are also old and also FALSE.

Wages can never rise so high as to make it impossible for the capitalist to carry on his business and live; under such circumstances it would be more profitable for the capitalist to give up his business. Consequently, the wages of the working man can never rise high enough to equal the value of his product. They must always be below that, to leave a surplus; it is only the prospect of a surplus that moves the capitalist to purchase labor power. It is, therefore, evident that in the capitalist social system the wages of the workmen can never rise high enough to put an end to the exploitation of labor.

It is the disposal of this surplus that drives capitalists to look for markets and incidentally leads to wars. But the fact concerning us here now is that markets are not found to consume the surplus as quickly as it is produced, hence gluts occur; there is a cry of over-production, and many workers are unemployed. This is the "difficult problem" of the capitalists, viz., "How to solve the labor problem of unemployment, and still keep the working class out of control of industry?" That problem, Mr. Beeby, is unsolvable. Not all the Arbitration or Conciliation Acts ever conceived in the brain of a politician can solve it that way. In England the employers see the writing on the wall, and are going to establish "Industrial Councils" for a similar purpose as your Board of Trade. But what the employing class would call a "reasonable standard of comfort" probably, nay surely, will not satisfy the workers, and they most certainly will demand something more, and we will hear again employers condemning the "unreasonable demands of labor." "A fair thing's a fair thing, but the workers are over the odds; fancy, they demand the full product of their labor." Such a demand is, of course, "unreasonable" to the employer. Well, there is a remedy. Employers are not necessary for the carrying on of industry. The wage system can go the same way as chattel slavery and serfdom went. There need be no longer any gluts, any "over production," which really means "under consumption" by the working class. THE WORKERS CAN CONSUME ALL THEY PRODUCE. Hence there need be no unemployed if there are no employers.

Now as to strikes. Mr. Beeby, if you think the workers are going to bind

themselves down to give a fortnight's notice of their intention to strike—well, you are putting up a bluff that will not stand the first puff of dissatisfaction. Fancy giving notice to employers to organise an army of scabs, "volunteers" and "loyalists," and give the boss two full weeks to do so; so that as soon as the workers ceased work, the work could be carried on immediately by "free" labour. Oh, Mr. Beeby, get your head read!

But no strike is to be legal in the Public Service, says Mr. Beeby, "because a Government concern was not run for making a profit. . . . they were run for the sole purpose of paying interest on the capital invested." Gosh! Do you think we are children or imbeciles not to know that the million or two sterling "interest on capital invested" that the workers in the Government railways have to produce over and above their wages is PROFIT, and a surplus wrung from the workers who produce it in the sweat of their toil? Is the "interest" on Government concerns any different to the interest bearing dividends of any commercial "profit making business"? No, there is no difference.

But, workers, remember this Bill of Beeby's has penalties attached. Funny ain't it, that the boss wants to conciliate the workers, yet always holds a blind gun up his sleeve. These are the penalties:—

If a substantial number of members of a union take part in an illegal strike the Government will issue process against the union. In regard to inciting to strike, any newspaper which incites to strike will be proceeded against the same as any individual will be.

Picketing is to be abolished. That means that the employers are to be given every facility to urge workers to scab on their class, but if any worker urges his fellow workers not to scab, but to remain loyal to the working class, then dire penalties are to be enforced. And this is a free country! ! !

The Bill also says that if a union wishes to take an open ballot as to whether they shall strike or not, they shall not be allowed to do so. All ballots must be secret, and it is open to the Minister of Labor to step in and take a secret ballot. The Bill provides that the vote must be taken in the presence of one of the officers of a union acting as a scrutineer; the returning officer to be the Under-Secretary for Industry.

Nevertheless, workers, this Bill of Beeby's is going to be a failure. The remedy is no remedy. It leaves the capitalist class in possession and control of the industries. Under such a regime precautions are always taken that Labor's representatives are outnumbered and outvoted. This bill is to be extended to enable unions to acquire property and to carry on businesses. This will enable the Government always to hold over their heads the power of seizure of their property and funds in event of their disobeying the tyrannical measures of the law.

No working class union should have large sums invested. All income should be used for the purpose of pushing Labor's demands as often and unrelentless as circumstances allow. Workers! NO COMPROMISE.

With the ownership of industry comes the control of industry. The working class must control the affairs of industry, not through any political acts or outside sources, but they must control the affairs of industry through their own delegates elected from the industrial departments of labor.

The workers can only dominate industrial affairs where they are in full control. They are in full control only when they OWN collectively the machinery of production and all that appertains thereto. But such schemes as put forth by Willis that the coal miners should purchase a mine and drive the other mine owners out of business by competition are misleading and mischievous. The coal barons, by their earlier exploitation of labor are now in control of such labor saving machines of production and have such control of the distributing agencies, that such schemes as this would be a failure so far as any betterment of the coal miners as a whole is concerned.

No, workers, there is only one remedy, and that is the message of the Australian Socialist Party. The workers must organise into industrial unions based upon a clear recognition of the class struggle and aiming steadily at the taking and holding of the means of production for the workers by the workers. Such an in-

Socialism, Socialists,
and Industrial Unionism.

By BIDDY BILINDA.

The position today in so-called socialist circles is intolerable from a revolutionary point of view.

On every hand are evidences that the workers are eager to listen to any suggestion of home of release from wage slavery, yet how many of their reputed leaders, having "absorbed" the "interest" and "exploitation" process, sufficient energy or sense of direction to emphasise the necessity of their welding their united strength in revolutionary industrial unions.

Sunday after Sunday, the resolutions of socialist unions, the passionate endorsement of the mass of workers, the demonstration of the proletarian capitalist class, the elaborate description of the modern socialist scheme, the working class and unions with a flow of money to subsidize the movement of a social revolution in the near future. The effect of all this is to keep the workers in a state of confusion and to keep them from the daily grind of the struggle. The workers are not to be misled by the "socialist" leaders who are only too ready to take the money of the capitalist class and to use it for the purpose of keeping the workers in a state of confusion and to keep them from the daily grind of the struggle.

In the past, the workers have been misled by the "socialist" leaders who are only too ready to take the money of the capitalist class and to use it for the purpose of keeping the workers in a state of confusion and to keep them from the daily grind of the struggle. The workers are not to be misled by the "socialist" leaders who are only too ready to take the money of the capitalist class and to use it for the purpose of keeping the workers in a state of confusion and to keep them from the daily grind of the struggle.

This purposeless method of obtaining recruits, and allowing their potential strength to be diffused in every direction but that of actually accomplishing the revolution, can no longer be regarded as efficacious or even sane.

It should never be forgotten that the enemy we oppose is a very advanced efficiency and device. Our wind blown, disorganised ranks are no match for the consolidated ranks of organised capitalism.

Our present method of recruiting, and allowing their potential strength to be diffused in every direction but that of actually accomplishing the revolution, can no longer be regarded as efficacious or even sane. It should never be forgotten that the enemy we oppose is a very advanced efficiency and device. Our wind blown, disorganised ranks are no match for the consolidated ranks of organised capitalism.

Industrial union as the Workers' International Industrial Union, meets the position. It will organise the workers from the bottom up. First in the union of their industry, then the industrial unions into departments of industry, and then a General Administration elected from the various departments. This is to be the Industrial Parliament controlled by the workers in industry, that is destined to replace the Parliament of the political state controlled by the property interests of the exploiters of labor.

Workers! Now is the time to organise. Great changes are ahead. Your emancipation draweth nigh. But the emancipation of the working class must be the class conscious act of the workers themselves. The Workers' International Industrial Union points the way. It is for you to follow. Your Freedom rests with yourself. Act now and organise! Forward for the lock-out of the master class!

Socialism and War.

(This lecture was delivered by Comrade James B. Scott at the A.S.P. Hall, Melbourne, on Sunday, Feb. 3.)

by the trained and watchful legions of the enemy.

But no capitalist class on the face of the earth would tolerate such pusillanimity for one hour.

The persuasive powers of the journalist, the parson, and the politician are supplemented by a war Cabinet and a vigorous and perfectly organised defence department. Every recruit secured is clapped straight into the ranks to become a unit in an army trained and equipped with every appliance for modern warfare. And it is the army that counts, not the well-wishers whose sympathies the recruiting organisations have enlisted.

The Socialist movement must take advantage of the example afforded by capitalism.

The platform, the press, the soap box are our recruiting agents, but the Workers' International Industrial Union must be our invincible army of revolution.

Fellow workers, do you not realise that between the rothy denunciations of the present system and the glorious prophesies of the future, there is a gap which the average Socialist orator does not fill and to bridge? The means to be employed are to be left to the post-graduate student in the very distant future.

So you can see, my friends, that the Socialist movement is a social, but not a political, movement. It is a movement to bring about the social changes which are the basis of the new order, but it is not a movement to bring about the political changes which are the basis of the new order.

Among a's reflection will demonstrate the fall of such a position. That the Social Union does not aspire to be an agent in bringing about the new order, is evidenced by the frequency with which the question of terms with regard to the revolution is mooted at the meetings.

The capitalist vision is clearer than that of any average Socialist. The more encephalic nature of the trade union has been eloquently recognised by employers, as is demonstrated by the report in the "Age," 18-12-18, of a speech delivered by Dr. Addison, Minister of Reconstruction, before the Reconstruction Council, London. The doctor said:—

"The governing consideration in all reconstruction matters is increased production of wealth. Toward this end employers and employees must cooperate. There must be industrial peace, for which it is essential that employers shall join an employers' association, and employees shall join a trade union."

Dr. Addison actually regards trade union organisations as a means of securing increased production! No capitalist could so deliberately assume that the organisation known as The Workers' International Industrial Union is conducive to such an end.

The need of emancipation of the wage slaves is clearly too evident.

Do you not endorse the sentiments expressed in the following preamble of the W.I.U. Brother? If so, your place is in the ranks of that organisation.

PREAMBLE W.I.U.

"The working class and the employing class have nothing in common. There can be no peace so long as hunger and want are found among millions of working people, and the few who made up the employing class have all the good things of life.

Between these two classes a struggle must go on until the workers come together on the political field under the banner of a distinct revolutionary political party governed by the workers' class interests, and on the industrial field under the banner of One Great Industrial Union to take and hold all means of production and distribution, and to run them for the benefit of all wealth producers.

The rapid gathering of wealth and the centreing of the management of industries into fewer and fewer hands make the trades union unable to cope with the evergrowing power of the employing class, because the trades unions foster a state of things which allows one set of workers to be pitted against another set of workers in the same industry, thereby helping defeat one another in wage wars. The trades unions aid the employing class to mislead the workers into the belief that the working class have interests in common with their employers.

These sad conditions must be changed,

Let us go back eighteen years, (for the past predicts the future) to the Paris Congress of 1900, there in the embryo we will see the aspirations of the future political Socialist. Many things happened at this Congress, but the most notable was the Kautsky resolution, which will be long remembered by the revolutionaries as the loophole through which the political opportunists could escape the straight and narrow path that leads to Socialism.

The resolution reads as follows:—

Kautsky Resolution, Paris 1900.

"In a modern democratic state the conquest of the public power by the proletariat cannot be the result of a coup d'état; it must be the result of a long and painful work of proletarian organisation on the economic and political fields, of the physical and moral regeneration of the labouring class and the conquest of municipalities and legislative assemblies."

"But in countries where the Government power is centralised, it cannot be conquered fragmentarily."

"The accession of an isolated Socialist to a Capitalist Government cannot be considered as the normal beginning of the conquest of political power; the International Congress has not to declare itself on this point."

"At any rate, the Congress is of the opinion that, even in such extreme cases, a Socialist must leave the ministry when the organised party recognises that the Government gives evidence of partiality in the struggle between capital and labour."

Here we find Kautsky suggesting the possibility of a Government (other than a working class Government) impartial to the working class. No Government ever has been up to the present, nor will be in the future, other than a class Government representing the material interests of a class; that class today is the ruling class who could not if they wished be impartial to labor's interests when labor is continually making demands on their surplus value. This resolution was supported by the revisionists, utopian pure and simple, political Socialists and the renegades of the movement including Hyndman, Vandervelde, Jaures, and above all, the notorious Millerand. The company this resolution kept surely speaks for itself. Millerand, it will be remembered, accepted office in the French Bourgeois Cabinet in 1898, and while still claiming to be a Socialist, sat cheek by jowl with the "Butcher of the Commune," General Gallifet. In 1900 this same Millerand came to the Paris Congress and supported the Kautsky resolution. Of this sad sight Daniel De Leon says:—

"Thus the gory spectacle of the traitor Millerand stalking the floor of the International Congress at Paris and the very window panes of the hall still rattling to the musketry that butchered the workers at Chalou and Martinique."

Is it not safe to assume that when men support an infamous proposal such as this is that they are as infamous at heart as the proposal itself, and is in keeping with their intentions for the future or their acts of the past.

the interests of the working class upheld, and while the capitalist rule still prevails all possible relief for the workers must be secured. That can only be done by an organisation aiming steadily at the complete overthrow of the capitalist wage system, and formed in such a way that all its members in any one industry, or in all industries, if necessary, cease work whenever a strike or lockout is on in any department thereof, thus making an injury to one an injury to all."

Come in, then, all ye peregrinating Socialists! Discard your day dream that Socialism will come from under the seats of the Socialist lecture hall, without any further effort on your part!

No longer can the excuse of the uncertainty of the outcome of such tactics be tolerated, for have not our brothers in Russia shown us what industrially organised workers can do?

If you would hasten the hour of your freedom, if you would enjoy the blessings of Socialism in your own lifetime, join and serve in the ranks of the Workers' International Industrial Union!

Russia has sounded the reveille!

Jules Guesdes, who has been described as "one of the ablest men in the Marxian school," was looked upon as a revolutionist to be relied upon; but when the crash came upon Europe Jules Guesdes accepted a seat in the French War Cabinet with the excuse that he thought it was his duty "to fight against the traitor workmen of Germany." Whether that was his motive or not the fact remains that the French capitalists had over six billion francs invested in Russia, where the interest was 3 per cent, greater than could be got in France, and this same interest had to be drawn out of the brain and brawn of the Russian proletarian, and to the assistance of this class he rushed when he acquiesced in the war, and followed the example of those he had formerly denounced as traitors to their class.

War makes strange bed-fellows indeed. We find with the rest of the French jingoes the author of "My country right or wrong," for the writing of which he (Gustave Herve) served a term in the prison of Paris, rushing to slaughter his "comrades" who accidentally happened to be born on the other side of the Rhine province; he lost his mental balance in face of the fact that he had spent many years of his life in attempting to tell the French working class that they had no country to defend. The political Socialists of France were no exception to the rule, they renounced the principles of a revolutionary movement, and fell into the well-laid trap that pseudo patriotism prepares for reformers.

Across the Channel we find divers organisations with as many opinions and ideas who claim to represent the philosophy of Socialism and Socialistic thought. Credit must be given to the Socialist Party of Great Britain for the stand they have taken in this war. In September, 1914, at the outbreak of hostilities, they issued a lengthy manifesto. They believe that the "working class must march to its emancipation from wage slavery and the domination of the capitalist class by the conquest of political power" from this it will be gathered that they are "Political Socialists" of the "pure and simple" type (honestly mistaken), but still mistaken. The manifesto issued by this movement cannot be excelled as far as Socialist principle is concerned, part of which reads as follows:—

"The Socialist Party of Great Britain, whilst placing on record its abhorrence of this latest manifestation of the callous, sordid and mercenary nature of the International capitalist class, and declaring that no interests are at stake justifying the shedding of a single drop of working class blood, enters its emphatic protest against the brutal and bloody butchery of our brothers of this and other lands, who are being used as food for cannon abroad while suffering and starvation are the lot of their fellows at home.

"Having no quarrel with the working class of any country, we extend to our fellow workers of all lands the expression of our goodwill and Socialist fraternity."

In February, 1915, the "Socialist Standard" came out with the following:—

"We declare again that there was nothing in the conditions of any country which justified Socialists voluntarily supporting either side in the war, and record our condemnation of such action as a betrayal of Socialist principles arising from the lack of political knowledge and unsound political organisation."

In this we are not agreed. The Australian Socialist Party believes that it was on account of the lack of industrial knowledge and unsound industrial organisation.

In spite of this lack of knowledge, it, the Socialist Party of Great Britain, acquitted itself nobly and well. But in their manifesto, while they are going over a list of the betrayals, they make the following reference to the S.L.P. of Britain:—

"The organisation calling itself the Socialist Labor Party has never understood how the workers are enslaved, and for years has propagated what it calls Industrial Unionism as THE method of emancipation. Its attempt to reconcile this position with its claim to be a political party has led to such confusion in its ranks that when the war broke out it was divided as to whether it should support it or oppose it."

To use a De Leonism, "the truth is that which fits all the facts," and this statement doesn't fit. The division they here speak of was nothing more or less than the going to pot of one man in correspondence to their official organ. Only one issue came out in partial support of the war, and since then the S.L.P. has taken up the most uncompromising stand of any movement in the world. Their official paper has been suppressed many times, coming out now in Glasgow, now in Manchester, and now elsewhere as they were pressed by the censor and the authorities under the Defence of the Realm Act.

The British Socialist Party occupied quite a different position. The leaders of this party including Will Thorn (who owes his seat to the Liberals and Tories of West Ham), Hyndman and Hunter Watts took an active part in the recruiting campaign, insisting that it was the duty of the workers of Great Britain to shoulder rifles and shoot down the workers on the continent. Just previous to this Hyndman had stated that "which ever side won the workers would not benefit a single jot." Surely this is an accusation out of his own mouth. And not unlike the performance of Hasse and Schiedmann in their mission to Italy for the benefit of the capitalist Government of Germany, Thorn, O'Grady and Sanders went on a mission to Russia on behalf of the class who exploit the workers of Great Britain to persuade the Russian workers to continue the war on the Eastern side. Owing to this attitude a split took place, and the secessionists, including Hyndman, Irvine, Watts, Lee, and Hunter, formed what is now known as "The National Socialist Party." The irrationality of such title is quite on a par with the preposterous people who compose it, and are at the present time showing how pro-capitalist and anti-working class they can be. A fitting name would have been the National Socialist win the war party. The traitors to the working class were rewarded in various ways for the support they rendered to the capitalist Government in their time of trial. Hodge, the I.L.P. member for Gorton was elevated to the rank of Labor Minister; within a few days after he was so elevated he showed his appreciation by threatening the boilermakers of Birkenhead, who were trying to get better conditions—with punishment through the powers he possessed under the Defence of the Realm Act.

Another of the I.L.P. office-hunters and labor-betrayers was crowned as Minister of pensions in the person of G. N. Barnes, M.P. for the Blackfriar District of Glasgow. It was pointed out to him that over 100,000 victims of capitalist greed had been discharged from the British army as medically unfit for future service without a pension or an allowance of any kind; this traitor eased the feelings of those unfortunates by stating:—

"It has been claimed that these men should be put on pension. Inasmuch as the doctors have passed them in . . . I want to say that they will not get it while I am in office."

Taken from the official report, Col. 254, March 6th, 1917.

Arthur Henderson has always been looked upon by the capitalist class as a sane politician, hence his position in the War Cabinet of the British Government. It is generally understood that whenever Henderson makes a move he is "getting in out of the wet." He resigned from the Cabinet, and when we of the revolutionary movement saw him making a move in that direction we predicted that he was doing so not as a matter of principle, but to be of more service to the capitalist class, events have since proved the correctness of our contention. Stupid and treacherous and all as he is he had more sense than to accept the position as British representative to Russia under the Bolshevik regime.

The British Independent Labor Party has since returned to sanity, and pleasing it is to relate that in the very near future they will rid themselves of the political tricksters of the Henderson, Barnes, Hodges type. Amongst the men we have met in Australia who turned dog on the movement are Ben Tillett and Tom Mann. Tillett went "NEAR" the front and reported back the need for men, then entered Parliament as an "Independent." Mann said there wasn't much difference between the German capitalist class and the British capitalist class, but he would rather have the British. Shortly afterwards he ran for the secretaryship of a craft union.

Before departing from the British movement let us briefly go over parts of their various manifestoes and draw some comparison which may be of interest to those who are interested in the workers' march toward emancipation.

To be Continued in Next Issue.

Craft or Industrial Organisation?

MILICENT HOLLYWOOD.

Craft forms of organisation are obsolete, because craft methods of production no longer generally obtain. While it was possible for every man to own his own tools, craft unionism was logical, the only form of labor organisation possible, and it served its purpose. But craft forms of production having passed, so also must craft forms of organisation pass, if the working class wants to defend itself and attain to a better social state.

Craft unionism will never enable our class to alter its present social status—while, even we stick to this obsolete weapon—the robber class can and will regard our best efforts as a force and a huge joke, as indeed they are, and whilst even the force of trying to fight organised robbery with out of date organisation continues, our class will continue in wage slavery.

A thousand and one things point to the need for industrial organisation, both for the purpose of defending our class from too much "iron heel" in the present, and eventually, when strong enough, to bring in collective ownership of the means of life.

Development of Machinery: Its Effect.

One man with modern farming machinery can now raise food enough for a thousand persons. A modern grain elevator can load more grain into the ship's hold in one hour than could previously be done by ten men in 12 hours, and working for the lick of their lives.

One girl operating a modern shoe-making machine can make shoes for about one thousand people in an 8-hour's day, oil fuel coming rapidly into use will enable capitalism to dispense largely with human labor power.

Large labor saving machinery debars the small man or individual manufacturer from owning them. Hence companies or collective ownership by capitalists. The big machinery requires workers to work in co-operation, hence they produce collectively.

The superfluity of goods, so manufactured, combined with the struggle for existence in the midst of plenty, forces on the worker the necessity of owning the machinery and ending their misery. Collective production, sooner or later, begets the idea of collective ownership.

Under capitalism, "labor saving machinery" means that the owners of huge machinery can dispense with so much "human labor power," the machine being more profitable to them.

Whilst under Socialism if such machinery was collectively owned and could be operated by such comparatively few workers, then the surplus human labor power, could produce something else, or if not they could lessen the hours of those who work, or else multiply the number of machines. The less labor used, or the more machinery accomplished, the easier it would be for the race when we have democratic or collective ownership, but not before.

Machinery does not now save labor—because though it reduces the number employed and required to produce a certain article, the capitalist, hungry for profits, gives nothing more to the workers. Machinery under capitalism is both labor saving, that is in the number of laborers required, and of course in consequence, wage saving. Then, the rapid development in electricity, is going to do away with the necessity for skilled labor, i.e., the advent of up to date machinery is going to make it possible to transfer workers from one department to another, as the machine used for one class of work will be worked similarly to that used for totally different productions.

So the line drawn between the crafts will be broken down whether craft likes it or not. Capitalism won't be likely to hesitate at committing such an outrage on crafter's sanctum out of any tender regard for crafter's feelings on the matter.

Then we have the ship building scheme of W. M. Hughes, which is also going to deal a big blow to craft and craft forms of organisation, making it imperative that the workers begin to organise on broad industrial lines for their own defence.

Then we will have Beeby's industrial legislation against which craft unionism

will be as impotent as a babe against the attacks of a man-eating tiger. You are surely not so innocent, you workers, as to suppose for the hair's breadth of a second, that this latest scheme of Beeby and Co. is intended to safeguard the interest of the workers. No; like all other laws, it is purely and unshamefacedly in the interest of the exploiters.

Mr. Beeby's industrial legislation threatens to be the fiercest piece of capitalist class tyranny we have yet had to face in this country. It will be not merely iron heel or iron toe, but the whole iron boot of capitalism which will be put into our class. So it behoves all intelligent men and women of our class to urge on the work of revolutionary industrial organisation for everyone worthy of the name of revolutionary—to get in earnestly and do their bit in preparing our class to meet the many rapidly changing industrial situations, and be prepared to defend themselves against the brutalities of the master class and master class organisation.

There must be a straight out advocacy of the revolutionary One Big Union, and insistence on all that it demands. There must be no coining with obsolete craft methods, or mere tin pot federation of unions, no watering down of our revolutionary industrial principles, no tinkering with the revolutionary policy, no fooling with watered down tactics, no compromise with craftism (which is helping to bolster up capitalism); no flirting with hybrid forms of industrial unionism; no telling the worker that federations of labor are steps in the right direction, for they are not—on the contrary, federations of labor are strides in the wrong direction, the only Right direction in this matter is the Revolutionary Industrial Union.

Federations of craft unions will do nothing more than provide sweet billets and toothsome pickings for officials, and ensure greater security for the boss, it will do absolutely nothing towards altering the social status of our class. The worker must cease fighting his own class. These are a few of the things which promise to awaken the toiler to the full facts of his miserable condition and degraded status. A commodity purchasable in the markets like hog's flesh, a thing for sale, same as a tin of tallow, a slave with the lowest possible market price tacked on to him; thrown on the human rubbish heap when out of repair, put into gaol if daring to hold an opinion opposed to the interest of the plunderer. Human cattle, muzzled sheep, much cheaper than machinery.

CAPITALISTS NOT SLEEPING.

The capitalist class are not asleep; they never talk of a compromise on their demands or of a modification of their claims. They know full well that when the workers organise and unite to keep the entire value of the wealth which they create there will be no more profits for the exploiters of labor.

When our class are organised on sound revolutionary lines they will be able to get in for the lick of their lives, and fight these robber barons to a finish, and with them the whole rotten system of wage slavery.

There must be no compromise with capitalism, or craft unionism, no modification of our demands, that the present brutal system must go. There must be no weakness in our movement, no sidetracking the worker, no going backwards, no toleration of the legal machinery which capitalist politicians and law makers have erected for our subjugation. We must let the machinery of arbitration courts and wages boards, and conciliation courts—we must let those things rust.

These things are only to turn the workers aside, down one of those blind alleyways, which our class are too apt to get trapped into, and where they are then at the mercy of the machine guns of capitalism.

The march of the proletariat must ever be forward. And equipped with the many collective weapons which revolutionary organisation provides we will have nothing to fear from the capitalist class. Craft forms of unionism are only helping to bolster up the present immoral state of things.

Whilst revolutionary industrial organisation will place us in a position to drive the final nail into the coffin of capitalism, and a final spike into the big guns of this vile system. But if we slacken our run, if we weaken one iota, if we yield one inch or water down our demand, it will be like hitting all around the nail and spike, and not touching the head.

"He either fears his fate too much,
Or his deserts are small,
Who fears to put it to the touch,
To win or lose it all."
Workers unite—you have nothing to lose but your chains (the vile chains of slavery), and you have a world resplendent with freedom a beauty to gain.

A. S. P.

NEWS AND NOTES.

MELBOURNE NOTES.

Miss Whitford deserved a much better audience at the A.S.P. Hall on Sunday, Feb. 24th; rain accounted for small attendance.

The lecturer gave a very lucid and interesting address on Women in Industry, from a craft union viewpoint. Miss Whitford is the organiser for the clothing trades; and if ever the miserable fallings short of trades unionism was exposed, it was done in that address; but the lecturer, though hoping for One Big Union in the future, said that their main effort now was to get the clothing workers in the different States, federated under a Commonwealth Arbitration Award. In discussion, it was pointed out that much work remains to be done in showing the craft unionists what industrial unionism really is. Most of them are still under the impression that any loose scheme of federation or amalgamation, means eventually One Big Union. When a crisis occurs they will find that it really is One Big Union, just strong enough to make them weep; and instead of a federation it is a separation. The lecturer stated that only in one factory in Melbourne did the men unionists insist that all the girls should be members of a union; she appealed to the men to teach the women their economic position in life.

It is because of the craft spirit that men take no interest in the girls. In a proper industrial union, all workers in one factory would be in a shop branch of the local union, hence it would be the duty of all members of the industrial union to see that all workers, both male and female, were enrolled in that shop branch, and if a girl left one factory to work in another, she would still be in the same local union, though in another shop branch; and instead of a craft union or going chasing round the factories to find out where their members are, the shop steward in each factory would sign the transfer card of each unionist, and automatically they would change their shop branch and could be kept tab of.

That sweating still exists to an enormous degree was proved by the speaker; she gave instances of prosecutions, where women had been only paid one-third of the award rates for piece work, and only earned 3d. per hour. She said that the big millinery shops employing seven girls can, the award rates being based on six years' service to reach the maximum of 25/- a week, keep the total weekly wage bill down to £4/10/-; and we all know the prices paid by Mrs. Toorak and Mrs. Potts for millinery creations. Thus the girls are robbed of the product of their labor to the extent of 400 per cent.

Organisation is the only remedy to improve matters. And we would strongly advise Miss Whitford to put the plan of industrial unionism as put forth by the Workers' International Industrial Union, and we are sure she will recognise that such a form of industrial unionism is the only one to organise the workers effectively.

During the lecture three detectives noisily pushed into the hall, presumably on a heresy hunt, but after listening about ten minutes and hearing only the class war from an industrial point of view, they quietly faded away. We wonder when these products of the capitalist system, themselves born of their position, and cease to act the spy on working men and women?

Propaganda meetings are now being held on Friday nights at Richmond and Brunswick, and an effort is to be made to reach all the industrial suburbs. To help towards the "International Socialist" gaining the much needed self supporting basis, the general secretary having told us that 1000 more copies must be sold each week if the paper is to continue, members of Melbourne Branch have guaranteed to take 12 dozen copies a week over and above the usual branch sales, which in future are to be pushed more energetically. Sympathisers round Melbourne are urgently wanted to lend a hand in getting the workers to read the "International Socialist," which is recognised as the soundest and best working class paper in Australia.

—Press Correspondent.

UNITY.

Just before going to press we received a write up on unity by E. E. Judd. It was just in time for publication, owing to the fact that we were awaiting a reply from the S.L.P. to a question put by our executive to them; also the length of the article, it was held over.

A so-called answer has been received from the S.L.P., so Judd's write up will be published next issue.

TO UNATTACHED SUPPORTERS

Whosoever you are, if you believe in Scientific Socialism, you must recognise the need for organisation. Why not set a good example to the workers whom you come in contact with, and whom we know you try to educate, by joining up with the A.S.P.

If there is no BRANCH in your locality, you can become a MEMBER AT LARGE, and thus become a REAL LIVE WIRE.

For further information, drop a line to the General Secretary, A.S.P., 115 Goulburn Street, Sydney.

BRANCH DIRECTORY.

Any branch desiring matter published under the above heading, should write clearly what is needed, and forward same to this office.

BROKEN HILL.

Socialist Hall, Sulphide St.
All rebels making their way to the "Hill" will receive a welcome at the above address.

CORRIMAL BRANCH.

R. Lewis, Main Street, Corrimal, Secretary.

IPSWICH BRANCH.

P. Stallard, School, Ipswich, Honorary Secretary.

MELBOURNE BRANCH.

47 Victoria St., Melbourne.
Library and Reading Room for members.
Lecture held every Sunday Evening.
Economic class every Wednesday evening.
Visitors welcomed.

MT. LARCOM.

Secretary, Chas. Birch, Mt. Larcom, Mt. Gladston.

NEWTOWN BRANCH.

Hall, Harte's Arcade, King St., Newtown.
Library for Members.
Business meeting held alternate Thursday evening.

SYDNEY BRANCH.

Hall, 269 Pitt St., City.
Library for members.
Lecture every Sunday Evening.
Debating class held every Monday evening.
Business meeting every alternate Tuesday evening.
Dance every Friday evening.

AUSTRALASIAN SOCIALIST PARTY LITERATURE DEPARTMENT.

Ancient Society—Lewis H. Morgan; cloth, 6/-; posted, 7/-.
Britain for the British—R. Fitzsimond; paper cover, 6d.; posted, 7d.
Capital—Karl Marx; 3 vols., 8/- each; posted, 8/-.
Charles Darwin and Karl Marx—E. Aveling; paper, 7d.; posted, 8d.
Economic Discontent—Father T. J. Hagerty; paper, 2d.; posted, 3d.
Economies of Socialism—H. M. Hyndman; cloth, 3/-; posted, 3/9.
Human Slaughter House—W. Lamazus; paper, 1/-; posted, 1/8.
Introduction to Socialism—N. A. Richardson; paper, 3d.; posted, 4d.
Love's Coming of Age—E. Carpenter; cloth, 1/6; posted, 1/8.
Landmarks of Scientific Socialism—Engels; cloth, 4/-.
Morris England—R. Blatchford; paper, 6d.; posted, 7d.
Mutual Aid—P. Kropotkin; paper, 1/6; posted, 1/8.
New Socialism—The R. R. La Monte; paper, 6d.; posted, 7d.

IMPORTANT.

When ordering literature it is well to add the cost of registration (3d.). This is necessary to guarantee delivery.

Printed and Published by William Josepa Thomas, at 115 Goulburn Street, Sydney, for the Australian Socialist Party.

SOCIALIST HALL
369 Pitt Street.

EVERY FRIDAY EVENING, DANCE.

LECTURE EVERY SUNDAY EVENING